

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

JENIFER ESHOM,

Plaintiff,

v.

KING COUNTY, a Washington
municipal corporation,

Defendant.

CASE NO. 23-cv-28

ORDER CONSOLIDATING CASES

This matter comes before the Court on Plaintiff Jennifer Eshom and Defendant King County's Stipulated Motion to Consolidate Cases For Discovery Purposes. Dkt. No. 24. Jennifer Eshom's case was removed to this Court on January 6, 2023. Dkt. No. 1. On January 2, 2023, Joseph Eshom's case was removed to this Court in *Eshom v. King County*, 2:24-cv-7 (W.D. Wash.), wherein King County filed a Notice of Related Case relating to this matter. The Eshoms are husband and wife. Dkt. No. 24 at 1. On January 19, 2024, the parties stipulated to consolidating this matter with Joseph Eshom's pursuant to LCR 42(b) on January 19, 2024. *Id.*

The parties stipulate that the cases "present[] a mutuality of facts, causes of action, legal theories, counsel, and defendants." Dkt. No. 24. This matter and

1 *Eshom v. King County*, 2:24-cv-7 (W.D. Wash.) involve Plaintiffs Jennifer Eshom’s
2 and Joseph Eshom’s claims arising from King County Sheriff’s Office (KCSO)
3 termination of their employment related to COVID-19 vaccinations. *Id.* Specifically,
4 Plaintiffs allege they requested a religious exemption and accommodations from
5 COVID-19 vaccination requirements, which KCSO denied. *See id.*; Dkt. No. 1-2. The
6 cases likewise involve the same causes of action. *Id.* The parties stipulate that
7 consolidation for the purposes of discovery will promote efficiency and conserve
8 resources. Dkt. No. 24 at 3.

9 Under Fed. R. Civ. P. 42(a), “[i]f actions before the court involve a common
10 question of law or fact, the court may . . . consolidate the actions.” *See also* LCR 42.
11 The Court also agrees that it “may consolidate cases for limited purposes, including
12 for discovery proceedings only.” Dkt. No. 24 at 3 (citing *Hayes v. Corr. Corp. of Am.*,
13 No. 1:09-CV-00122-S-BLW, 2011 WL 3962153, at *8 (D. Idaho Sept. 7, 2011)).
14 Finally, the Court has broad discretion to consolidate cases under Fed. R. Civ. P. 42.

15 The Court agrees with the parties’ reasoning for consolidation, as
16 consolidating these matters for discovery purposes will promote efficiency. The
17 Court GRANTS the parties’ request to consolidate this matter with *Eshom v. King*
18 *County*, 2:24-cv-7 (W.D. Wash.) for the purposes of discovery and their request to
19 strike the deadlines in this matter.

20 Within 14 days of this order, the parties must file a Joint Status Report (JSR)
21 identifying their proposed new trial date(s), explaining the specific aspects of the
22 cases they request to be consolidated (for example, whether the parties request a
23 unified case schedule, including expert discovery deadlines and motions, and

dispositive motions), and whether the parties request a dual captioned case. The parties' JSR will also address why the cases should not be wholly consolidated under one Cause number.

It is so ORDERED.

Dated this 7th day of February, 2024.



Jamal N. Whitehead
United States District Judge